B and E Convalescent Centers, Inc. and Convalescent Employers Service, Inc. d/b/a Gardena Convalescent Center *and* Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO. Case 31-CA-10915

July 27, 1981

DECISION AND ORDER

Upon a charge filed on March 4, 1981, by Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, herein called the Union, and duly served on B and E Convalescent Centers, Inc. and Convalescent Employers Service, Inc. d/b/a Gardena Convalescent Center, herein called Respondent, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by the Acting Regional Director for Region 31, issued a complaint and notice of hearing on March 17, 1981, against Respondent, alleging that Respondent had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Copies of the charge and complaint and notice of hearing before an administrative law judge were duly served on the parties to this proceeding.

With respect to the unfair labor practices, the complaint alleges in substance that on January 26, 1981, following a Board election in Case 31-RC-4862,[1] the Union was duly certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate; and that, commencing on or about February 17, 1981, and at all times thereafter, Respondent has refused, and continues to date to refuse, to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative, although the Union has requested and is requesting it to do so. On March 25, 1981, Respondent filed its answer to the complaint admitting in part, and denying in part, the allegations in the complaint.

On April 20, 1981, counsel for the General Counsel filed directly with the Board a Motion for Summary Judgment. Subsequently, on May 7, 1981, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice To Show Cause why the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted. Respondent thereafter filed a response to the Notice To Show Cause.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the Board makes the following:

Ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment

In its response to the Motion for Summary Judgment, Respondent denies the validity of the Union's certification on the ground that the Board erred by overruling its objections to the election held in Case 31-RC-4862. Counsel for the General Counsel contends that Respondent is raising issues which were considered and resolved in the representation case, and that this it may not do. We agree.

The election in Case 31-RC-4862 was conducted on October 28, 1980, pursuant to a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election. The tally of ballots shows that, of approximately 40 eligible voters, 20 cast ballots for, and 19 against, the Union; there were no challenged ballots. Thereafter, Respondent filed timely objections to conduct affecting the results of the election. On December 11, 1980, the Acting Regional Director issued and served upon the parties his Report on Objections in which he recommended overruling Respondent's objections and certifying the Union. After Respondent filed exceptions to the Acting Regional Director's report, the Board issued its Decision and Certification of Representative on January 26, 1981,[2] in which it adopted the Acting Regional Director's recommendations to overrule Respondent's objections and, thus, certified the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the appropriate unit.

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section 8(a)(5) is not entitled to relitigate issues which were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding.[3]

All issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding, and Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege that any special circumstances exist herein which would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that Respondent has not raised any issue which is properly litigable in this unfair labor

[1] Official notice is taken of the record in the representation proceeding, Case 31-RC-4862, as the term "record" is defined in Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended. See *LTV Electrosystems, Inc.*, 166 NLRB 938 (1967), enfd. 388 F.2d 683 (4th Cir. 1968); *Golden Age Beverage Co.*, 167 NLRB 151 (1967), enfd. 415 F.2d 26 (5th Cir. 1969); *Intertype Co.* v. *Penello*, 269 F.Supp. 573 (D.C.Va. 1967); *Follett Corp.*, 164 NLRB 378 (1967), enfd. 397 F.2d 91 (7th Cir. 1968); Sec. 9(d) of the NLRA, as amended.

[2] Not reported in volumes of Board Decisions.

[3] See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.* v. *N.L.R.B.*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); Rules and Regulations of the Board, Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c).

practice proceeding.[4] Accordingly, we grant the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the basis of the entire record, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

B and E Convalescent Centers, Inc. and Convalescent Employers Service, Inc. d/b/a Gardena Convalescent Center, a California corporation with an office and place of business in Gardena, California, is engaged in the operation of a convalescent hospital. In the course and conduct of its business operations, Respondent annually derives gross revenues in excess of $100,000, and annually purchases and receives at its Gardena, California, facility goods or services valued in excess of $5,000 directly from suppliers located outside the State of California.

We find, on the basis of the foregoing, that Respondent is, and has been at all times material herein, an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act, and that it will effectuate the policies of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. *The Representation Proceeding*

1. The unit

The following employees of Respondent constitute a unit appropriate for collective-bargaining purposes within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

> All employees employed by the Employer at its facility located at 14819 South Vermont Avenue, Gardena, California, excluding all office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

2. The certification

On October 28, 1980, a majority of the employees of Respondent in said unit, in a secret-ballot election conducted under the supervision of the Regional Director for Region 31, designated the Union as their representative for the purpose of collective bargaining with Respondent.

The Union was certified as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in said unit on January 26, 1981, and the Union continues to be such exclusive representative within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. *The Request To Bargain and Respondent's Refusal*

Commencing on or about February 4, 1981, and at all times thereafter, the Union has requested Respondent to bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of all the employees in the above-described unit. Commencing on or about February 17, 1981, and continuing at all times thereafter to date, Respondent has refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining of all employees in said unit.

Accordingly, we find that Respondent has, since February 17, 1981, and at all times thereafter, refused to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the appropriate unit, and that, by such refusal, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent, set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with its operations described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

V. THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order that it cease and desist therefrom, and, upon request, bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of all employees in the appropriate unit and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

In order to insure that the employees in the appropriate unit will be accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of certi-

[4] Although Member Zimmerman did not participate in the underlying representation proceeding, he considers the Board bound to grant summary judgment without regard to the merits of the issue Respondent now attempts to relitigate. See *Bravos Oldsmobile*, 254 NLRB 1056 (1981).

fication as beginning on the date Respondent commences to bargain in good faith with the Union as the recognized bargaining representative in the appropriate unit. See *Mar-Jac Poultry Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Commerce Company d/b/a Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817; *Burnett Construction Company*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

The Board, upon the basis of the foregoing facts and the entire record, makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. B and E Convalescent Centers, Inc. and Convalescent Employers Service, Inc. d/b/a Gardena Convalescent Center, is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. All employees employed by the Employer at its facility located at 14819 South Vermont Avenue, Gardena, California, excluding all office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.

4. Since January 26, 1981, the above-named labor organization has been and now is the certified and exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

5. By refusing on or about February 17, 1981, and at all times thereafter, to bargain collectively with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees of Respondent in the appropriate unit, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) of the Act.

6. By the aforesaid refusal to bargain, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing, employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act, and thereby has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Seciton 8(a)(1) of the Act.

7. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, B and E Convalescent Centers Inc. and Convalescent Employers Service, Inc. d/b/a Gardena Convalescent Center, Gardena, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Refusing to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the following appropriate unit:

> All employees employed by the Employer at its facility located at 14819 South Vermont Avenue, Gardena, California, excluding all office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Upon request, bargain with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

(b) Post at its facility in Gardena, California, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."[5] Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director Region 31, after being duly signed by Respondent's representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director for Region 31, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this

[5] In the event that this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the Notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

Order, what steps have been taken to comply herewith.

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Hospital and Service Employees Union, Local 399, Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All employees employed by the Employer at its facility located at 14819 South Vermont Avenue, Gardena, California, excluding all office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

B AND E CONVALESCENT CENTERS, INC. AND CONVALESCENT EMPLOYEES SERVICE, INC. D/B/A GARDENA CONVALESCENT CENTER